28

1 2 3 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 5 6 7 8 TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED LLC No. C 14-3640 CW and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC, 9 ORDER ON Plaintiffs, **ADMINISTRATIVE** 10 MOTION TO SEAL v. 11 (Docket No. 316) CANON, INC. et al., 12 Defendants. 13 14 No. C 14-3643 CW TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED LLC 15 and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC, (Docket No. 99) 16 Plaintiffs, 17 v. 18 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, 19 Defendant. 20 21 TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED LLC No. C 14-3645 CW and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC, 22 (Docket No. 84) Plaintiffs, 23 v. 24 NEWEGG INC. et al., 25 Defendants. 26 27

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED LLC and MCM PORTFOLIO LLC,

No. C 14-3646 CW

(Docket No. 100)

Plaintiffs,

v.

SEIKO EPSON CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Before the Court is an administrative motion to seal filed by Plaintiffs Technology Properties Limited LLC and MCM Portfolio LLC. (Case No. 14-3640, Docket No. 316; Case No. 14-3643, Docket No. 99; Case No. 14-3645, Docket No. 84; Case No. 14-3646, Docket No. 100).

Under Civil Local Rule 79-5, a document may be filed under seal only if a party establishes that the portions sought to be sealed "are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law." Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). Any sealing request must be narrowly tailored to cover only sealable material. Id. The request must be supported by the designating party's declaration establishing that the information is sealable. Id. subsection (d).

"Historically, courts have recognized a 'general right to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents.'" Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006). In considering a sealing request, the Court begins with "a strong presumption of access [as] the starting point." Id.

Ca
14
Do
3.
Ca
14
Do
99
Ca
14
Do
84
Ca
14
Do
10
1(

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiffs seek leave to file under seal certain ase No. confidential documents from the International Trade 4-3640, ocket No. Commission investigation. 16 1. Exhibit B to the Declaration of Benjamin R. Askew: the confidential version of the Initial Determination on Violation of Section 337 and ase No. 4-3643, Recommended Determination on Remedy and Bond. 2. Exhibit C to the Askew Declaration: ocket No. 9 confidential version of the ITC opinion. Plaintiffs' motion will be GRANTED. First, the documents were filed for the benefit of and at the ase No. 4-3645, request of the Court, and they are not associated with ocket No. a dispositive motion. Second, as noted in the Askew 4 Declaration, public versions of both documents were previously submitted as exhibits to the parties' claim construction briefs, and the redactions in the sealed ase No. 4-3646, versions are narrowly tailored to confidential ocket No. information only. 00 23

CONCLUSION

For the reason set forth above, Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (Case No. 14-3640, Docket No. 316; Case

Case 4:14-cv-03645-CW Document 88 Filed 09/09/15 Page 4 of 4

For the Northern District of California

United States District Court

Chidealeith											
	IT IS S	O ORDER	ED.								
No.	14-3646,	Docket	No.	100) is (GRAN'	ΓED.				
No.	14-3643,	Docket	No.	99;	Case	No.	14-3645,	Docket	No.	84;	Case

Dated: September 9, 2015

